



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/475,963	12/30/1999	ROGER L. BUIS	BO999023-003	7122

7590 05/06/2004

KURT P LEYENDECKER ESQ
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 900251026

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	10

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/475,963	BUIS ET AL.
	Examiner Matthew J. Ludwig	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17, 19, 20, 24 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17, 19, 20, 24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed on 8/25/03.
2. Claims 18, 21-23 have been cancelled in the amendment. Claims 1-17, 19, 20 and 24-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 17, 24, and 25 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 17-18, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose has been withdrawn as necessitated by Applicant's proposed Amendment. The rejection of claims 7-9 and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose in view of Håkon Wium Lie, W3C Core Styles, 1997 (herein Core).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. *Claims 1-6, 10-18, 20 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose et al (herein DeRose; USPN 5708806 – filing date 6/7/1995) in view of W3C, HTML 4.01 Specification: W3C Recommendation, 24 December 1999, esp. ch. 11 (herein HTML 4.01).*

Regarding independent claim 1, DeRose teaches a method for generating electronic documents (col 3, ln 14-21). DeRose teaches a plurality of data records in a file, referred to as elements,

Art Unit: 2178

which may contain text (col 3, ln 34-36). Each element has associated with it a type name for use as an identifier (col 3, ln 37-43; compare with "*associating...data record;*").

DeRose teaches the use of a style sheet. Style sheets specify format characteristics corresponding to type names (col 3, ln 44-52; compare with "*specifying...a document;*").

DeRose also teaches formatting the data according to the associated parameters when generating the document (col 3, ln 19-21; compare with "*formatting...document.*").

DeRose does not explicitly cite performing the method of the invention with a datastream as input. However, DeRose does disclose an input of a file with a plurality of segmented input data (col 7, ln 61-66). The input of datastreams into the invention taught by DeRose would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time. This would have enabled a plethora of documents to utilize the formatting advantages given by DeRose.

DeRose does not explicitly disclose creating regions that define an area in a document. However, HTML 4.01 does disclose creating tables in an HTML document that allow data to be arranged and formatted in a certain region of a document page (see 11.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of DeRose and HTML 4.01. DeRose's invention is based on markup languages (SGML and HTML, for example). Applying specifications that were known and typical at the time of the art would have made the invention useful to those of ordinary skill in the art, specifically in this instance by allowing users more control over page formatting and data placement.

Regarding dependent claim 2, DeRose discloses associated a type name for use as an identifier with data (col 3, ln 37-43; compare with "*associating...data record;*"). DeRose also teaches the

use of a style sheet for specifying format characteristics corresponding to type names (col 3, ln 44-52; compare with "*specifying...a document;*").

DeRose does not explicitly disclose creating regions that define an area in a document. However, HTML 4.01 does disclose creating tables in an HTML document that allow data to be arranged and formatted in a certain region of a document page (see 11.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of DeRose and HTML 4.01. DeRose's invention is based on markup languages (SGML and HTML, for example). Applying specifications that were known and typical at the time of the art would have made the invention useful to those of ordinary skill in the art, specifically in this instance by allowing users more control over page formatting and data placement.

Regarding dependent claim 3, DeRose teaches style sheets containing formatting data to be included in the generated document (col 3, ln 44-52).

Regarding dependent claim 4, DeRose teaches printing a document on a screen as an output to a user (col 3, ln 14-21).

Regarding dependent claim 5, DeRose discloses markup elements as having start or end tags (col 4, ln 1-3). These tags acts as identifiers for the elements, and correspond to the element's type name.

Regarding dependent claim 6, DeRose discloses type names as having fixed size fields (col 5, ln 40-48).

Regarding independent claims 10, 17, 24 and 25 and dependent claim 18, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale. Additionally, DeRose discloses the implementation of his invention in a computer system comprising a processor and storage memory (col 7, ln 18-52).

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 12, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 4 and 3, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 13 and 20, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 2 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 14-16, the claims are drawn to the positioning of data in a multi-page document. It was known and typical in the art at the time of the invention to implement data properties that served to repeat specific data in certain parts of the document throughout a plurality of pages. Examples of this include the header and footer options. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of DeRose and HTML 4.01 to implement these options. Such a combination would have allowed users to generate documents with such standard options, reducing a user's workload of repeating text and possibly reducing the document size.

6. *Claims 7-9, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose in view of W3C, HTML 4.01 Specification, and further in view of Håkon Wium Lie, W3C Core Styles, 1997 (herein Core).*

Regarding dependent claim 7-9, DeRose does not explicitly disclose associating identifiers with data in one computer and specifying parameters in another computer. However, Core teaches the use of style sheets in such a way that a style sheet is fetched off a server for use with a document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of DeRose and Core in order to provide users with the option of using prefab style sheets and formatting alternatives. Associating identifiers with data is done as disclosed by DeRose in the instant claim's base rejection. The style sheets specify parameters for identifiers (as per the rejection of claim 1, also reference W3C Cascading Style Sheets, level 2: CSS2 Specification). Core teaches an implementation in a network when disclosing a browser fetching a style sheet from a server.

Additionally, Core does not explicitly disclose formatting data on a third computer according to the specified parameters. However, it was known and typical in the art at the time of the invention for third party users to access web documents on their own computers. Core teaches creating a document referencing a style sheet on a server. This document may have been a web page, wherein an author different from the referenced style sheet author provided the content data. When a third party user accessed the page, the content would have accessed the server to retrieve the style sheet, further formatting the document for user viewing.

Furthermore, Core's disclosure teaches the first computer providing the style sheet as a server. It was known and typical in the art at the time of the invention for servers to allow access to data, but not to access data on the requestor's computer unless explicit permission was granted.

Regarding dependent claim 19, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 19, 20, 24, and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues on pages 9-10 of the amendment that there is no disclosure in DeRose that associates an identifier with a region defining an area on a document page. . The Examiner notes that (as presently claimed), DeRose teaches unique identifiers assigned to each element of the document. See column 5, lines 55-58. The elements being referred to by DeRose are elements within a method for generating a representation of an electronic document. Such electronic documents may be understood as a tree like structure. An element, or node of the tree is defined by the markup in the electronic document. A table model disclosed in the secondary reference, HTML 4.01 Specification, provides a technique that allows authors to customize and personalize specific data. Table rows may be grouped into a head, foot, and body sections, via different elements. The documents elements suggest a layout process within a region of a document. These same elements within a document allow for the direct association of style sheets, which include format characteristics. In order to display a document on an output device in a manner that enables a user to navigate it readily and to find as much as possible, a suitable representation of the document is needed. Because the claim limitations are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art, the unique identifier methods of

DeRose combined with the document table techniques of HTML 4.01 Specification provide a reasonable interpretation of newly amended claims when read as a whole.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Selvin et al. USPN 6,718,329 filed (7/16/98)

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML
April 27, 2004



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER